UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/737,388	12/16/2003	Hong Min	POU920030170US1	5371

46369   7590   04/18/2008
HESLIN ROTHENBERG FARLEY & MESITI P.C.
5 COLUMBIA CIRCLE
ALBANY, NY 12203

EXAMINER
ANYA, CHARLES E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2194	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/18/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/737,388	MIN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Charles E. Anya	2194	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *1/17/08*.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-3,5-8,10-12 and 14-17* is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-3,5-8,10-12 and 14-17* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

   1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
      application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-3,5-8,10-12 and 14-17 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

**2.   Claims 1-3,5-8,10-12 and 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second
paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly
claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.**

The following terms antecedent basis:

i.   "the sender computer process" on line 12 of claims 1 and 10.

For the purpose of this office action the Examiner would change "a sender" to "a
sender computer process".

ii.   "the receiver" on lines 16 and 17 of claims 1 and 10 respectively.

For the purpose of this office action the Examiner would change "the receiver" to
"the receiver computer process".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3.   **Claims 1-3 and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being**

unpatentable over U.S. Pub. No. 6,487,607 B1 to Wollrath et al. in view of U.S.

Pub. No. 2001/0047406 to Araujo et al.

4.   As to claim 1, Wollrath teaches a method of transferring executable program

code between computer processes, the method comprising: providing by a sender

computer process an object which comprises a hashtable, the hashtable having at least

one set of elements, one element of the at least one set of elements comprising

executable program code (Steps 702/703 Col. 10 Ln. 41 – 50), the providing

comprising: creating an empty hashtable, integrating executable program code into the

hashtable (Col. 10 Ln. 45 – 50), and serializing the hashtable into a serialized data

object for transport to the receiver computer process ("...marshals parameter..." Col. 10

Ln. 48 – 50); wherein the program code comprises logic which employs as data input

the hashtable ("...object array...including code or reference to code..." Col. 10 Ln. 45 –

61) and transferring the object from the sender computer process to a receiver

computer process (Step 703 "...transmits..." Col. 10 Ln. 48 – 50), retrieving the

executable program code from the hashtable (Steps 704-706 Col. 10 Ln. 612 - 67) and

invoking the executable program code with the at least one other element of the

hashtable as data input thereto (Steps 707-710 Col. 11 Ln. 8 – 14).

Wollrath is silent with reference to wherein data is added to the hashtable by the receiver computer process prior to invoking of the executable program code retrieved from the hashtable with the hashtable as the only data input thereto.

Araujo teaches wherein data is added to the hashtable by the receiver computer process prior to invoking of the executable program code retrieved from the hashtable with the hashtable as the only data input thereto ("…authenticates…" page 23 paragraph 203).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill the art the time the invention was made to modify the system of Wollrath with the teaching of Araujo because the teaching of Araujo would improve the system of Wollrath by providing a technique of attempting to verify the digital identity of the sender of a communication where the sender being authenticated, often referred to as the principal, may be a person using a computer, a computer itself or a computer program.

5.   As to claim 2, Wollrath teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the at least one set of elements comprises multiple tuples, each tuple comprising a first element and a second element ("…object id, method hash…" Col. 10 Ln. 48 – 61), and wherein the second element of at least one tuple comprises the program code (method hash…" Col. 10 Ln. 48 – 61), and the second element of at least one other tuple comprises data relevant to the program code ("…method hash…" Col. 10 Ln. 48 – 61).

6.   As to claim 3, Wollrath teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the providing

comprises providing the object as a serialized data object and transporting the

serialized data object from the sender computer process to the receiver computer

process ("...marshals parameter..." Col 10 Ln. 48 – 67), and wherein the method further

comprises deserializing the serialized data object at the receiver computer process to

obtain the hashtable, scanning the hashtable for executable program code (Steps 704-

706 Col. 10 Ln. 62 – 67), and invoking the program code with at least other of the

hashtable as data input thereto (Step 707 Col. 11 Ln. 8 – 14).

7.   As to claims 10-12, see the rejection of claims 1-3 respectively.

8.   Claims 5-8 and 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over U.S. Pub. No. 6,487,607 B1 to Wollrath et al. in view of U.S.

Pub. No. 2001/0047406 to Araujo et al. as applied to claims 1 or 10 above, and

further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,721,740 B1 to Skinner et al.

9.   As to claim 5, Araujo and Wollrath are silent with reference to the method of

claim 1, wherein the providing comprises providing multiple serialized objects, each

serialized object having a different hashtable therein, and transporting a first serialized

object from a first sender computer process to a receiver computer process and

transporting a second serialized object from a second sender computer process to the

receiver computer process, and deserializing the first serialized object and the second

serialized object at the receiver computer process to obtain a first hashtable and a
second hashtable.

Skinner teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the providing comprises
providing multiple serialized objects, each serialized object having a different hashtable
therein, (Clients 300A/300B "…serialized…" Col. 16 Ln. 21 – 33) and transporting a first
serialized object from a first sender computer process to a receiver computer process
and transporting a second serialized object from a second sender computer process to
the receiver computer process (Clients 300A/300B "…by one application…" Col. 16 Ln.
21 – 51), and deserializing the first serialized object and the second serialized object at
the receiver computer process to obtain a first hashtable and a second hashtable
(Server-Side Communication Management Components 305A/305B Col. 16 Ln. 46 –
51).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill the art the time the invention
was made to modify the system of Araujo and Wollrath with the teaching of Skinner
because the teaching of Skinner would improve the system of Araujo and Wollrath by
providing a process for inter-process communication whereby data is exchanged
between programs using a shared memory and running at the same time.

10.   As to claim 6, Skinner teaches the method of claim 5, wherein the first sender
computer process, the second sender computer process, and the receiver computer
process are on different computing units (figure 3).

11.   As to claim 7, Skinner teaches the method of claim 5, further comprising merging
the first hashtable received from the first sender computer process and the second
hashtable received from the second sender computer process at the receiver computer
process into a common hashtable ("…shared portion of memory…" Col. 16 Ln. 34 – 51),
and iterating through the common hashtable for executable program code to be invoked
using the common hashtable as the only data input thereto ("…read out…" Col. 16 Ln.
34 – 51).

        As to claim 8, Araujo teaches the method of claim 7, further comprising adding
data to the common hashtable at the receiver computer process, the data being
relevant to executable program code in the common hashtable and being added prior to
invoking the executable program code using as data input only the common hashtable
("…authenticates…" page 23 paragraph 203).

12.   As to claims 14-17, see the rejection of claims 5-8 respectively.

Response to Arguments

        Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are
moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles E. Anya whose telephone number is 571-272-3757. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Thomson can be reached on 571-272-3718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Meng-Ai An/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2195

cea.